

2 copies
stock

JPRS: 3426

23 June 1960

RETURN TO MAIN FILE

DOCUMENT

THE LENINIST THEORY OF THE SOCIALIST STATE, AND MODERN TIMES

- USSR -

Author: V. V. Platkovskiy
Editor: V. V. Platkovskiy
Translator: V. V. Platkovskiy
Publisher: V. V. Platkovskiy
Distributor: V. V. Platkovskiy

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for Public Release
Distribution Unlimited

19991008 091

Photocopies of this report may be purchased from:

PHOTODUPLICATION SERVICE
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
WASHINGTON 25, D. C.

Reproduced From
Best Available Copy

U. S. JOINT PUBLICATIONS RESEARCH SERVICE
205 EAST 42ND STREET, SUITE 300
NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

FOREWORD

This publication was prepared under contract by the UNITED STATES JOINT PUBLICATIONS RESEARCH SERVICE, a federal government organization established to service the translation and research needs of the various government departments.

JPRS: 3428

CSO: 3803-D

THE LENINIST THEORY ON SOCIALIST REVOLUTION

AND CONTEMPORARY REVISIONISM

- USSR -

[The following is a translation of an article by A. P. Butenko in Voprosy Filosofii (Problems of Philosophy), Vol. XIV, No. 4, Moscow 1960, pages 46-57.]

The social progress made in the twentieth century cannot be isolated from Leninism. Since the dawn of the century, the light cast by Lenin's ideas have guided revolutionary efforts. The more intense revolutionary struggles became, the more evident were the truths embodied in Leninist theory.

In October 1917 the working people of Russia, under the leadership of the Communist Party and its leader, V. I. Lenin, accomplished the first victorious socialist revolution. A new stage in the development of Marxist-Leninist theory - one which constituted a thorough practical proof and translation into reality of this theory - began.

The Great October Socialist Revolution constituted the true triumph of Leninism. It demonstrated its correctness, and thus dealt a crushing blow to all of the bourgeois and petit bourgeois "theories" of those who reviled proletarian ideology. However, due to the peculiar logic in the class struggle, attacks by the enemies of Marxism and Leninism did not only fall off from that time on, but increased apace. The more extensively Marxism is implemented in life, the more of a danger it constitutes for the bourgeois, and thus the more intensive, varied and sharp the attacks of bourgeois ideologists and revisionists upon Marxist theory become. This anti-Marxist tendency toward an ever more active and intense attack has become especially noticeable in recent years. Hand in hand with the overt enemies of socialism, modern revisionists have emerged as a parasite living off the new phenomenon of public life and representing themselves as marching under the banner of "creative Marxism-Leninism". In reality they are opponents of Marxist science.

One of the favorite targets of the modern revisionists is the Marxist-Leninist theory of class struggle, the dictatorship of the proletariat and the socialist revolution. This is

no happenstance. Our historical epoch essentially began in October 1917, the commencement of the transition from capitalism to socialism. The Marxist-Leninist theory of socialist revolution inevitably came to light with primary and contemporary significance. It became the central focus for both practical and theoretical struggles.

Attempts at revision of this Marxist-Leninist theory are varied. The distorted mirror of contemporary revisionists reflects both the history of the development of Marxist-Leninist revolutionary teachings in connection with the experience acquired in the Great October Socialist Revolution and the Marxist-Leninist theory of the nature of the revolution, which serves as a guide in the current class struggle. In their numerous "historical" researchings, these revisionists make extensive use of the long defunct dogmas of social democracy, Trotskyism, and anarcho-syndicalism in their dispute with Leninism and distortions of the experience of the USSR. This indicates how little originality there is in their exercises in sophism and the concepts they espouse. Their only innovation is the disguising of well-known reformist theories as Marxist doctrine, and their application to the new real facts.

Without going into all the revisionist distortions in this connection, let us examine two concepts which illustrate revisionists' misinterpretation of history and their twisted view of the revolutionary transition from capitalism to socialism.

The Historical Experience of the Great October Socialist Revolution and Its Distortion by Re- visionists

As is common knowledge, the most important theoretical concepts which served as the scientific foundation for the revolutionary activities of the Russian communists were Lenin's teachings on the possibility of the victory of the socialist revolution and socialism in a single and separate country. From the beginning, this view was in sharp conflict with social democratism and Trotskyism. These movements did their utmost to discredit and disprove that theory. Soon after Lenin set forth this concept in 1915, theoretical debate on it gave way to a practical test: the revolutionary activity of the masses at the end of the First World War put into practical application the Marxist-Leninist theoretical principles, and mercilessly destroyed outmoded dogma.

The victory of the October Socialist Revolution which created the conditions necessary for the construction of socialism in Russia constituted decisive practical proof of the

justice of Lenin's teachings on the primary success of socialism in a single country. The experience of the October Revolution demonstrated that with international solidarity on the part of the proletariat, the working people of just one single country could effect the prerequisites for the construction of socialism. Continuing to combat Trotskyism, Lenin, even after the revolutionary victory, often emphasized that despite a capitalist encirclement, the Russian workers' class has all the conditions needed for the construction of a socialist society. He believed that N.E.P.'s Russia would become a socialist Russia. (See Works, Vol. XXXIII, page 405.)

This prophesy was realized. As a result of the efforts of the entire Soviet people under the guidance of the Communist Party, the Soviet Union, surrounded by capitalism, was the first state in history to establish socialism; rather than a society based on private property and rent by class antagonisms, a new world emerged in which the foundation of public life was socialist ownership of the means of production. Here, for the first time, with the elimination of private property, the dream of man became a reality. Plundering classes and the exploitation of man by man were eliminated. Production forces, freed from the bonds of exploitative relationships, leapt forward in development. From a once backward country, the Soviet Union developed into one of the most highly developed countries in the world, and first put into living practice the principle of socialism: "From each according to his capacity, and to each according to his work."

The construction of socialism in the USSR, which represented the performance of the tasks established by the October Socialist Revolution, and which created the prerequisites for the modern transition to the stage of expanded communist construction, completely disproved the Trotskyite assertions as to the impossibility of building socialism in a single country alone. It turned these claims into theoretical rubbish ready for the garbage heap of history. The establishment of a socialist society in the USSR while it was surrounded by capitalist nations served as full proof of the truth of Lenin's belief in the possibility of social construction in a single pioneering country, and transformed the theory into reality. As a result of the international victory of socialism, the Twenty-first Congress of the CPSU was able to derive the conclusion that socialism in the USSR has won out in the USSR totally and definitively, and that no force in the world could restore capitalism therein.

Thus life itself resolved the argument which began in 1915.

Forty years have passed since these debates.

In the present day, many years after Lenin's conclusions as to the possibility of the victory of socialist revolution and construction in a single country was demonstrated as a valid theory and a practical accomplishment, the modern revisionists have invaded the political sector. They can find nothing better to do than to resurrect Trotskyite dogma. Naturally some of their arguments have altered, but the basic Marxist and opportunist aspects of their claims remain the same.

Today's enemies of Leninist, masquerading as Marxists, reiterate the ideas of their predecessors on the "national limitation" of Leninism and the entirety of the experience of the revolutionary class struggle in Russia. American revisionists, led by D. Gates, assert that Leninism was the product of specifically Russian conditions and is therefore inapplicable to develop capitalist countries, the USA in particular. The Canadian revisionist J. Salsberg regards Leninism as a special "Russian Marxism" and demands its rejection in favor of "Canadian Marxism". "The newly proposed socialist path", as Salsberg calls revisionism, "Means that on the basis of Canadian achievements and the profound international changes which have occurred, it is necessary to create a wide potential for the unification of Canadian Marxists..." (J. Salsberg, "Toward a Socialist Realignment in Canada", "National Affairs, No. 2, 1957). The essence of all these attacks is the Trotskyite concept of the impossibility of developing the postOctober Russia towards socialism.

What is their purpose, and how do contemporary revisionists view Lenin's concept in this regard?

Here as elsewhere, the revisionists attempt to utilize the new developments in life to prove the validity of a distorted interpretation of the new problems which now confront Marxist-Leninist theoreticians. The fact is that the victory of socialist revolution in the USSR and the expanded construction of socialist society in the people's democracies have of necessity posed a new task for Marxists: the comparison of the historical experience of the USSR and that of other socialist countries such as to comprise a scientific analysis of the formation of the communist structure and to establish the general laws governing this process. While the Soviet Union was the only socialist country, it was impossible to answer these questions in terms of relating its experience to that of other socialist countries. Now the situation differs. The needed factual material is available, and there is an acute need for the proper and practical utilization of the experience

of the Soviet Union - the first socialist country.

The utilization of this experience cannot be effected mechanically as the dogmatists would have us believe. The development of socialism in the USSR was undoubtedly guided not only by the general and inevitable factors common to all countries constructing socialism, which provided the principal foundation of Soviet experience, but also by certain specific ones typical of that country alone, created by Soviet conditions and certainly not applicable to other countries. In order for Soviet experience to be used creatively in other countries, then, it is necessary that socialist construction in the USSR be studied, the essentials separated from the superfluous, the necessary differentiated from the incidental, and common factors isolated from the specific.

Concentrating on the specific in the construction of socialism rather than the common factors, the revisionists use every means to distort the historical experience of the USSR and to magnify the special aspects of its development. They fail to mention the common and essential aspects of this experience.

One of the points of departure for contemporary revisionism as regards the development of the USSR is the claim that it really developed into state capitalism, or "Stalinism", as a peculiar political and economic system intermediate between capitalism and true socialism. This slanderous antiMarxist view has found its ultimate expression in the book written by the Yugoslav renegade M. Djilas and entitled "The New Class". In it he states that the "communist revolution" is a form of "state-capitalist revolution", and that the relationships established by its victory are state-capitalist relations. ("The New Class", New York, 1957). It is for the very purpose of providing a theoretical "basis" for these absurd views of the development of "state capitalism" and "Stalinism" in the USSR that the modern revisionists attempt to adapt Trotskyite theories of the impossibility of constructing socialism in a single country. Like the Trotskyites, they assert that within the framework of a single country surrounded by capitalism an attempt to build socialism must inevitably be doomed to failure and will lead to the degeneration of the new regime.

In order to put a sort of system into their historical claims, modern revisionists ignore the facts and state that the theory of establishment of a single socialist state is a purely "Stalinist" concept which constitutes nothing more nor less than "nationalist socialism". Without doubt, this deliberate falsification is intentional. How could the

revisionists fail to be aware that it was not Stalin but Lenin who set forth and demonstrated the theory that in the imperialist epoch "socialism cannot win out simultaneously in all countries. It will triumph, " said Lenin, "First in one or a few countries, while in others, for some time, will remain bourgeois or prebourgeois." (Works, Vol. XXIII, page 67).

It is needless to show that this theory has nothing to do with "national socialism" or the revisionist theory of isolated socialist construction.

What is the objective meaning of these revisionist views? What is their purpose?

There is no doubt that in representing Lenin's theories in this regard as a "Stalinist concept of national socialism", the revisionists are attempting to minimize the international significance of the experience in the construction of socialism of our country. Actually, if "degeneration" of socialism had taken place here, and if the mistaken concept of "national socialism" had become a practically applied system, our experience would not have had international significance.

The revisionists must derive this antiMarxist conclusion in order to be able to force through their "brand of socialism", their "special path toward socialism" as distinct in principle from that followed by the USSR and the people's democracies.

This dirty road toward nationalist opposition to the experience of the October Revolution, the construction of socialism in the USSR and the revolutionary development of other countries is that pursued by Imre Nagi in Hungary and A. Giolitti in Italy. Their views are being relentlessly spread by revisionists in Yugoslavia as well.

We may take as an example the article by M. Popovic entitled "Notes on Certain Problems in Modern Socialist Thought". The author accuses all socialist countries of "state bureaucratism" and states that "It is this very situation which may give rise to more conscientious and systematic socialist forces, ideologically, politically and organizationally capable of battling bureaucracy, winning out over it, and pushing social development closer to socialism.....This is what has happened in Yugoslavia. This is what has been accomplished by the Union of Yugoslav Communists." (M. Popovic, "Notes on Certain Problems in Modern Socialist Thought", "Socializam" [Socialism], No. 4, 1959, page 45). Thus one country - Yugoslavia - has declared itself the model for the movement towards socialism.

It is clear that the Yugoslav misrepresentation of Leninism and of the whole of the history of the practical and ideological struggle is now being used to promote the opportunistic,

nationalistic and revisionist socialist concepts under the guise of "true laws". These concepts have nothing in common with Marxism-Leninism.

However, apart from the forty years of experience in the construction of socialism in our country, the experience in the people's democracies gainsay all the revisionists' attempts to minimize the international significance of Soviet experience. This is not surprising, for the basic laws governing the class struggle, the socialist revolution and the construction of socialism are identical for all countries, and it is impossible to disprove the internationally significant fact that it was these laws which were first formulated, implemented, and consciously utilized in our country, which was the first, as a result of the October Revolution, to take the road of socialist construction. These general laws governing the transition from capitalism to socialism consisting of socialist revolution, the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the transformation of capitalist economy to socialist economy, and its systematic and planned development, etc. under the guidance of the workers' class, were specifically enumerated in the Moscow Declaration at the conference of representatives of communist and workers' parties in socialist countries, which provided a definitive rebuttal to the revisionists' claims. It was these very laws which were first tested by the experience of the October Revolution and later by the experience acquired in the socialist development of other countries. They have become of such importance as to represent the international significance of the experience of the October Revolution, "Meaning by international significance," as Lenin put it, "The international importance and inevitability of the repetition on an international scale of that which has happened here." (V. I. Lenin, Works, Vol. XXXI, page 5).

Such is one of the Leninist theses under attack from the modern revisionists, and such are the various revisionist efforts to minimize the international importance of the historical experience of the October Revolution and the construction of socialism in the USSR. But no matter how fervently they try to fill the order, in a social sense, placed by the bourgeoisie, they cannot undermine the faith of the masses of the people in socialism, in the international significance of the experience of the country which first effected the transition from capitalism to socialism. Now that the rungs in the ladder leading towards socialism established by our country are being climbed by other socialist nations, Lenin's words have a particularly profound meaning and strength: "Now

a rather significant international experience lies before us. This eloquently demonstrates that some of the basic characteristics of our revolution were not of local, national, specific or exclusively Russian nature, but are of international significance." (Ibid). It is this international significance of the experience of the October Revolution that no one has been able to disprove.

The Theory of Social Revolution and the Revisionist Concept of the Growth of Capitalism into Socialism

The revisionists appear anxious to clarify the question of the acceptability of the Marxist theory of socialist revolution in terms of the current conditions and tasks of the communist movement. Here again they debate new problems, rejecting socialist revolution in varying manners - under the guise of tracing new capitalist phenomena, pretending the danger of a new world conflict, or claiming to develop "parliamentary" or "national" paths toward socialism. As it is not feasible to deal in detail with the antiMarxist aspects of each of these revisionist concepts, all of which should be shown up for what they are, we will discuss that which is most widespread - the "theory of transformation" of capitalism to socialism. This "theory" would have it that all countries are now progressing towards socialism, and are undergoing a process of "transformation of capitalism into socialism".

The philosophic foundation for this "theory" is a vulgar economic materialism which denies or minimizes the role of the subjective factor in history, that of the class struggle, and that of the Marxist-Leninist parties. It confuses what is objective and what is spontaneous. Methodologically, this "theory" is characterized by a substitution of simple evolution for dialectics, and in political nature, it is a typically reformist theory of the unregulated growth of capitalism into socialism adapted to combat the Marxist-Leninist theory of revolution, depicted by the revisionists as "outmoded", "dogmatic", and therefore unacceptable under current conditions.

Let us analyze the basic characteristics of this concept, which is shared by the Italian opportunist A. Giolitti and the American renegade A. Bittelman, as well as other revisionists.

As is common knowledge, the Marxist-Leninist theory of socialist revolution is founded upon the acknowledgement of the indisputable fact that the replacement of capitalism by socialism is not a simple matter of will but a historical neces-

sity linked with the acute conflict between developing production forces and outdated capitalist production relations. The elimination of this conflict is the inevitable result of the operation of the objective law governing the relationship between production relations and production forces.

Debating this factor, the revisionists take the facts that the above law requires the establishment of full public ownership of the means of production and that the current epoch is in fact one of transition from capitalism to socialism, and claim that "socialism has now become a worldwide process", and that "all of humanity has embarked upon it".

This view is inherently a denial of the basic principles of the Marxist-Leninist view of social development, and evidences a confusion between what is objectively necessary and possible and what is real and actual. The possibility of achieving the transition from capitalism to socialism is becoming a reality only as a result of the conscious revolutionary activity of the masses in the course of the class struggle, however.

Now the revisionists hug to themselves the fact, which is undisputed, that currently the world is ripe for socialism. But the existence objective prerequisites for the construction of socialism and the further development of countries will not, of their own accord and unsystematized, necessarily transform all of the world into a socialist system. They do not imply that "the whole world, the entirety of humanity, has already been directed along the path toward socialism and has taken a socialist stand." Lenin noted that human society is not so "wisely" or "conveniently" constituted for its advanced elements that at any time when social upheaval is ripe due to social-economic conditions it can take place instantaneously and automatically. A proper social force which will consciously carry out the revolutionary upheaval is needed. "An upheaval may be possible while the strength of its revolutionary creators is still insufficient to accomplish it. In such a case, society rots, and its degeneration may continue for scores of years." (V. I. Lenin, Works, Vol. IX, pages 338-339).

The belief that socialism and socialist production relations are developing in capitalist countries through technological process and the nature of modern productional means implies the identification of the objective prerequisites of socialism with socialism itself, and a denial of a need for a class struggle and of revolutionary work toward the transformation of the objective potential of socialism into socialism itself.

On the other hand, the modern historical phase is in fact a stage of transition from capitalism to socialism. But this transition is not at all taking place in the manner depicted by the revisionists. It is being effected only by those countries in which, during a revolutionary struggle, the proletariat has established its regime, not in all countries simultaneously. The other countries are still capitalist. In other words, despite the contrary view of the revisionists, society is undergoing a transition from capitalism to socialism not simply because the material foundation and scientific and technological achievements in the modern world have created new socialist production relations, but because under such conditions the workers' class in many countries could succeed in establishing their regime through revolution. It is only by this method that socialist reorganization has been achieved.

A similar view is that of "transformation". According to this idea, the entire world has already embarked along the path toward socialism. This, incidentally, is not an original notion. More than forty years the emergence of socialism was so described. A book dealing with this matter states: "As a picture fades from a screen to be replaced by another, capitalism is fading away, and the outline of socialism is becoming ever clearer." Whose are these words? This is a sentence written by the well-known British laborite Ramsay MacDonald, Taken from his book "The Socialist Movement." Only revisionists can believe that such assertions are a new phenomenon in Marxism.

Let us go further. The Marxist-Leninist theory of socialist revolution is founded on the fact that the objective law governing the relationship between production relations and the nature of the production forces, which form the foundation for revolutionary development, does not act automatically. The transition to socialism can only be effected by the conscious utilization of this law by the revolutionary masses which serve as the motive force of the revolution, and on the fact that this law is implemented through these revolutionary activities on the part of the masses - through the class struggle.

In view of the revolutionary changes which have taken place in the world, and the impossibility of totally ignoring the conscious revolutionary activities of the masses, modern revisionists have been forced to acknowledge this fact. However, they view it as only one of the possible methods of abolishing capitalism and moving ahead to socialism. In this light, they proclaim the two contradictory social-economic

systems in the world today - socialism and capitalism - as but two methods - the conscious and the spontaneous - of transition towards socialism, a transition which they claim is taking place all over the world. They claim that transition to socialism via the second method began with the economic crisis of 1929-1933. These assertions represent the refraction through the revisionist mind of the new trends in social development: with the general crisis conditions in capitalist nations, the growth of socialism was accompanied by the spread in capitalist countries of state capitalism. The revisionists distort the nature of things and assert that there are two methods inherent in capitalism permitting its abolishment: the conscious elimination of the system through the process of socialist revolution, and the spontaneous elimination of it by reformation through state capitalism.

If we can believe the revisionists it appears that the transformation of capitalism toward socialism is taking place in capitalist countries through the selfliquidation of the foundation of the former - the private capitalist ownership of the means of production. Naturally, there are new processes operative in capitalist countries, and it would be folly to deny the modifications in capitalist ownership which are in fact taking place. This includes the changeover from individual capitalists to capitalist associations such as corporations and capitalist totalities, such as the bourgeois state. However, the fact is that after these transitions and modifications (which nowhere affect all private property) have taken place, the class nature of property remains the same. It does not become socialist but remains in the hands of the same capitalist class. In the period between 1937 and 1956 alone, the private wealth of capitalists in the USA such as the DuPonts increased to 810% the earlier figure, that of the Mellons to 960%, that of the Rockefellers to 890%, etc. It is only in the imaginations of the reformists that the true problem of capitalist reproduction and the enrichment of millionaires and billionaires, i.e. the largest private owners, constitutes the "elimination of private property" or a part of the mythical process of socialist development supposedly characteristic of all countries.

Using sophisms to conceal their complete capitulation to reformist theories of "spontaneous growth" of capitalism into socialism which have long been well-known, the revisionists frankly state: "Individuals, peoples, nations, and human society are now carrying out their historical work regardless of whether or not they know, are conscious of, what socialism is, or not, and whether or not they are enthusiastic about it. They

are bringing it about, and that is as it should be. World development must follow this path. Old methods are outdated and the level of production forces and their further development make the new process inevitable." (Article by M. Todorovic in the Yugoslav journal "Komunist" [Communist], Nos. 7-8, 1956, page 444). These modern concepts of historical fatalism are called up to undermine the revolutionary energy of the masses through claims that even without their conscious actions, without a revolutionary struggle, society will in any case progress toward socialism.

This revisionist notion represents a most gross distortion of reality, since two social-economic systems - capitalism and socialism - are described as alternate means of development toward socialism. They are made identical, and the division of the world into two camps, two systems, is denied. The differences between the two systems, inherent in their opposing social-economic and political natures, are described as differences in the method of development toward socialism. In one case, they say, there is conscious development (socialist states) and in the other, spontaneous development (capitalist countries).

The revisionists are not perturbed by the fact that the development in capitalist countries in the presumed "transformation towards socialism" does not involve the strengthening of the position of the working people, but that of the capitalist monopolists, or that while the percentage of working wages in the national income is dropping, the income of the largest monopolists is increasing and their capital is expanding rapidly. Thus the total income of all capitalist corporations in the USA increased from 6.4 billion dollars in 1939 to 45.5 billion dollars in 1956. Eight financial groups in the USA control a capital considerably in excess of 200 billion dollars.

By preaching the abandonment of the revolutionary struggle for socialism, today's revisionists are also attempting to provide a basis for the possible development of socialism as a kind of automatic and spontaneous process occurring independent of the will of the people. This is inherent in the ideas expressed by the Italian revisionist A. Giolitti, who substitutes technological progress for the socialist revolution. Stating that a "special path" toward socialism has been worked out in highly developed countries and that "where the capitalist structure is firmest and best developed the revolutionary path is that of structural reform" (A. Giolitti, "Reforme e rivoluzione" [Reform and Revolution], Turin, page 25), Giolitti assumes that technological progress will automatically lead to the elimination of capitalist production relations and superstructure.

Modern revisionists preach an automatic transition to socialism through technological progress and ignore the fact that social-economic laws are implemented only through the action of conscious individuals pursuing specific purposes. Outdated social groups may continue to pursue their own interests despite the requirements of economic laws, for example, despite the demands of the law governing the relationship between production relations and the nature of the production forces. Knowing that social laws can only be implemented by conscious activity on the part of the people, and that some (such as that stated immediately above) can only be effected by the deliberate and organized activity of the revolutionary masses and through class struggle, the reactionary forces take steps to destroy and disrupt this organized activities. In the minds of the revisionists, these laws would operate regardless of the activity of the various public groups.

The theory of automatic action of the law of transition from capitalism to socialism which is represented as creative Marxism-Leninism is not an original invention of the contemporary revisionists either. It is as old as reformism, which accepted the theory of spontaneity. At the beginning of this century, one of the creators of the Dutch Social Democratic Party, V. Fligen, in his book "The Dawn of the People's Liberation", similarly described a fantastic picture of the movement toward socialism. "We see," he wrote, "How a socialist society can emerge rapidly as a result not of the will of the people but as a natural and necessary consequence of the development of the method of production." More than fifty years have passed since he wrote this, but the promised "inevitable socialist society achieved without the force of the will of the people" has not yet come about in Holland.

The coincidence between modern revisionist inventions and these older reformist concepts needs no detailed commentary. It is easy to see that the former is but a new edition of the old Kautskiy theory of "automatic dissolution of capitalism", to which a few reformist modifications have been added to depict the "breakdown" as a "series of reforms" and to extend its duration. But its essence remains the same: today as before, the role of the conscious activity of the revolutionary masses - the only creators of socialism - is denied, as is the need for a class struggle on the part of the working people for their own political regime, and the only true revolutionary path toward socialism. The latter is replaced by unrealistic and mythical reform proposals.

Such is the second revisionist concept - that of transformation.

Marxism-Leninism has demonstrated and historical experience has borne out the fact that the basic problem in any revolution is that of the state regime. In the socialist revolution, it becomes a question of a state regime of the proletariat, of proletarian dictatorship. Without these, as history has proved, it is impossible to eliminate capitalist exploitation and to build socialism.

Modern revisionists, who believe in the theory of "transformation" clash head on in this connection as well with the basic foundation of Marxism-Leninism - the teachings as regards the dictatorship of the proletariat.

It is easy to see that the basic essential of the "theory of transformation" is an attempt to rule the class struggle, socialist revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat out of the conditions necessary for the construction of socialism. It presents the development of socialism in a reformist manner. The basic revisionist distortions in this "theory" include the substitution of economic materialism, sophism and eclecticism for historical materialism. Through these means, the objective prerequisites for socialism are identified with the development of socialism itself as a given social-economic process along with a fatalistic interpretation of social laws. The revisionists believe in spontaneity, and deny or minimize the role of conscious revolutionary activity on the part of the masses. They idealize modern capitalism, and slide over the ever more acute contradictions within it, and distort the nature of state capitalism.

Such revisionist "theory" constitutes only one form of the various revisions of the Marxist-Leninist theory of socialist revolution, but it clearly indicates that contemporary revisionists are incapable of providing any persuasive arguments the Leninist teachings on socialist revolution upon which a new society is being built.

* * *

A scientific theory, as Lenin noted, can only be considered complete when it is linked with practice and implemented in life. It is natural that these times, which are basically characterized by the revolutionary transition from capitalism to socialism, have provided tremendous factual material for the further creative development of the scientific theory of socialist revolution.

The discussion of the socialist revolution occupies a principal place in the major Party documents of recent years: the decisions of the Twentieth and Twenty-first Congresses of the CPSU, the declaration of the conference of representatives

of communist and workers parties in socialist countries, and in the materials of the brotherly communist parties. It is here, rather than in revisionist writings, that such problems as those concerning the general laws and specific forms in the transition of various countries toward socialism, the noncapitalistic path toward socialism, the total and final triumph of socialism, the law governing the transition from socialism to communism, the more or less simultaneous transition of socialist countries, and others, have been creatively developed on the basis of experience.

In our times, when socialist transformation is becoming a ripe issue in an increasing number of nonsocialist countries, two tasks set forth by Lenin are of particular importance: the search for the most realistic forms of approach toward socialist revolution, and the creative development of the problem of forms of revolutionary transition from capitalism to socialism.

The former problem is one of the concrete ways for attracting the masses to the cause of the revolutionary vanguard and their conversion to the new viewpoint necessary for the implementation of a socialist revolution.

On the basis of the heritage of Lenin's wisdom, the communist movement has over a period of thirty years worked out a creative solution to this practical and theoretical problem. On the eve of the Second World War, the problems of unity of action and a people's front had already been thoroughly clarified. When, during the war, democratic, antifascist, national-liberational tasks became the essential ones, communists in many European and Asiatic countries, creatively developing Leninism, succeeded in finding their own concrete means of leading the masses toward socialist revolution. As a result, the antifascist democratic revolution in Eastern Germany, the national and democratic revolution in Czechoslovakia, a democratic revolution of a new type in China, as well as the various people's democratic revolutions in other countries, creatively developed and practically implemented Lenin's theory as to the concrete forms of approach toward socialist revolution.

Under present conditions, as a result of the increased strength of socialism and the sharpening of capitalist contradictions, favorable conditions have once again been created for a rallying of the broad masses of the people around the workers class, and for leading them toward socialist transformation. Recently a further increase in oppression by financial capitalists. "The interests and policies of the small group of monopolists," states the declaration of the conference of representatives of communist and workers' parties, "Are in-

creasingly in contradiction not only with the interests of the workers' class, but also with all other strata in capitalist society - the peasantry, the intelligentsia, the small and middle urban bourgeoisie." For this reason, many varied social groups have a common interest in the development of an anti-imperialist democratic struggle and an increasing rapprochement to the struggle for socialism. Thus general democratic problems are being posed, and facilitate the unification of the broadest masses of the people. These current democratic movements, which are making it possible for the workers' class to lead the masses toward the implementation of socialist tasks, include the struggle of the peoples of capitalist countries to preserve their sovereignty, to defend democracy, to promote peace, and to combat war, as well as the national-liberation movements of peoples against colonialism, and for national independence and peace.

The specific approach of each country toward socialist revolution is conditioned by the variety of forms of revolutionary transition from capitalism to socialism. This matter was dealt with most concretely in 1916. He wrote: "All nations will achieve socialism. This is inevitable. However, they will not progress toward socialism in totally identical ways. Each will have peculiar aspects in one form of democracy or another, one form or another of proletarian dictatorship, one rate of transformation of the various aspects of public life or another. Nothing could be less tenable theoretically or more ridiculous from a practical point of view than the depiction 'in the name of historical materialism' of the future as a monochromatic or greyish landscape. This would be nothing but a caricature." (Works, Vol. XXIII, page 58).

Experience has brilliantly demonstrated the correctness of Lenin's forecast. The development of the world socialist system has clearly evidenced national-specific and national-particular aspects in the approach of each individual country to the resolution of a single international task - the elimination of the bourgeoisie, the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and the construction of socialism. On the basis of this Leninist experience, the communists set forth in the Moscow Declaration the general laws governing the transition from capitalism to socialism. It is on the basis of these very laws (and not by ignoring them, as the revisionists would do) that the variety of forms in transition toward socialism will appear.

The basic forms of transition toward a dictatorship of the proletariat and the construction of socialism are two: nonpeaceful and peaceful. The former type of socialist revo-

lution is linked with armed rebellion and civil war in the implementation of revolutionary tasks. Communist ideals do not advocate the use of force to compel. However, if the reactionary bourgeoisie prevents the masses from carrying out the fate of the history of capitalism through the use of its own bureaucratic-militaristic state, the masses are obliged to respond to force with force.

Now that the forces of democracy and socialism have increased so vastly throughout the world, the possibility of peaceful forms of development for socialist revolution has increased.

As a result of the armed defeat of fascism during the Second World War, the real potential for a peaceful growth of democratic revolution into socialist revolution emerged. These possibilities became a reality. Now, under current circumstances, there is an even greater scope for the application of such a variation in the development of democratic movements.

Creatively developing Leninism, communists have also demonstrated that there are now opportunities to achieve socialism by parliamentary means as one of the forms of peaceful development of socialist revolution. On what are such concepts based? Upon the general weakening of the position of the bourgeoisie and the strengthening of that of the workers' class all over the world, as well as within the capitalist system in particular. Gradually moving towards the acquisition of political domination, the workers' class is expanding the scope of its activities and increasingly mastering a wider variety of forms of struggle. The bourgeoisie is finding it more and more difficult to oppose the revolutionary pressure of the masses under the guidance of the workers' class and its vanguard.

All facts point toward the conclusion that as the ratio of strength on the international scene shifts in favor of socialism, the forms of transition towards it will be increasingly varied and each country will be able to "make its contribution to the variety in forms of democracy and transition towards socialism." (Ibid, page 58). This will facilitate the further creative development of the great Leninist concepts of socialist revolution.

5003

- END -